

## **REMARKS**

By this amendment, claims 1 and 3-10 are pending. Claims 1, 6, 7 and 8 have been amended. No new matter is introduced. The Office Action mailed July 30, 2007 withdrew the provisionally rejection of claims 1 and 3-6 under obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-6 of *Norcott* (U.S. Patent Application Serial No. 10/435,703, hereinafter *Norcott* '703. Claims 1 and 3-10 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as obvious over *Norcott* (U.S. 5,848, 405, hereinafter *Norcott* '405) in view of *Rauer et al.* (U.S. 6,161, 103).

### **A. Rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103**

The obviousness rejection of claims 1 and 3-10 over *Norcott* '405 in view of *Rauer et al.* is respectfully traversed, as the references do not disclose or suggest the features of the claims.. Independent claim 1 recites, "copying the recovery log from the on-line transaction processing (OLTP) system; storing the recovery log in a database object having at least one control column, obtaining change data from the recovery log stored in the first object based in-part on a column in the recovery log that holds data representing when a transaction has been committed, and inserting the change data into a plurality of change tables in a second database, where the change data is inserted into each of the plurality of change tables in a single transaction, each change table in the plurality of change tables having a column corresponding to the column in the recovery log, said change data representing modifications that has been performed to a plurality of source tables of the on-line transaction processing (OLTP) system and that correspond to the change tables in the second database."

On page 3 of the July 30, 2007 Office Action, The Examiner states that the *Norcott* reference teaches the limitation "copying change data from a recovery log of a first system to a first object in a second system" and cites col. 5 lines 59-61 and col. 6. lines 32-31 of *Norcott*,

which discloses the new data refresh process, where ROWID ranges are deleted from the ROWID range table and updates to a redo log. There is no discussion in the cited language regarding copying a recovery log as now claimed. The Norcott reference explicitly recites that the redo log merely records changes made to the database storing the new data. See Norcott col. 5, lines 54-62. There is simply no disclosure of copying a recovery log. While Norcott depicts a redo log in Fig. 6, there is no disclosure in the written description of Norcott that the redo log was copied. In fact, Norcott specifically discloses that the redo log records changes that occur in a database. This is different than copying the recovery log of a system.

The Applicant has also amended independent claims 1, 6, 7 and 8 to recite “obtaining change data from the recovery log stored in the first object based in-part on a column in the recovery log that holds data representing when a transaction has been committed, and inserting the change data into a plurality of change tables in a database of the second system, where the change data is inserted into each of the plurality of change tables at the same time, and wherein the obtaining and inserting is performed in a single transaction” As discussed above, Norcott does not disclose obtaining data from the redo log depicted in Fig. 6. Norcott explicitly discloses recording change data into the redo log. See Norcott col. 5, lines 54-62. In addition, there is no disclosure of new data being obtained based in part on a column in the recovery log that holds data representing when a transaction has been committed. Since there is no data that is obtained from a copied recovery log, there can be no data that is obtained based on data representing when a transaction has been committed. The portion of Norcott recited indicates that new data is obtained based on ROWID data. Lastly, there is no disclosure of inserting data obtained from a recovery log into a plurality of tables in a single transaction. Accordingly, Norcott does not teach the inventions now claimed by claims 1, 6, 7 and 8.

*Rauer et al.* does not cure the deficiencies of *Norcott*. Accordingly, the combination of *Norcott* and *Rauer et al.* does not teach or suggest the invention of claim 1.

Dependent claims 3-5 and 9-10, which depend from claims 1, 7 and 8, respectively, are allowable for at least the same reasons as their independent claims, and are separately patentable on their own merits.


**B. Conclusion**

For the foregoing reasons, allowance of the pending claims is requested. If the Examiner has any questions about this Amendment and to facilitate prosecution, the Examiner is encouraged to call the undersigned attorney. The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any insufficient fees or credit any overpayment associated with this application to Deposit Account No. 50-4047 referencing 19111.0229.

Respectfully submitted,  
Bingham McCutchen LLP

Dated: January 30, 2007

By:

  
Chadwick A. Jackson  
Registration No. 46,495  
(202) 373-6661 Telephone  
(202) 373-6001 Facsimile

CORRESPONDENCE ADDRESS:  
Bingham McCutchen LLP  
2020 K Street, N.W.,  
Washington, D.C. 20006